

		<u>Exceptional</u>	<u>Very Good</u>	<u>Satisfactory</u>	<u>Marginal</u>	<u>Unsatisfactory</u>
Affordability	Reduction in Development, Production and Ownership Cost	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • World-class application of "Lean Enterprise" concepts. • Excellent incentives to Subcontractors to reduce development, production and sustainment costs. • Excellent DMS initiatives. • Compelling evidence that the Affordability of the JSF Air System from a LCC/TOC is extremely well-balanced across development, production and sustainment using established processes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Successful application of "Lean Enterprise" concepts. • Highly effective incentives to Subcontractors to reduce development, production and sustainment costs. • Highly effective DMS initiatives. • High-quality evidence that the Affordability of the JSF Air System LCC/TOC is well-balanced across development, production and sustainment using established processes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate identification or application of "Lean Enterprise" concepts. • Adequately effective incentives to Subcontractors to reduce development, production and sustainment costs. • Adequately effective DMS initiatives. • Adequate evidence that the Affordability of the JSF Air System LCC/TOC is being balanced across development, production and sustainment using established processes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimal identification or application of "Lean Enterprise" concepts. • Minimally effective incentives to Subcontractors to reduce development, production and sustainment costs. • Minimally effective Diminishing Manufacturing Sources (DMS) initiatives. • Minimal development of a process to balance the JSF Air System Life Cycle Cost (LCC)/Total Ownership Cost (TOC) across development, production and sustainment. • Minimal evidence that the Affordability of the JSF Air System from a LCC/TOC is being balanced across development, production and sustainment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contractor fails to meet criteria for Marginal performance.
	Development of an Affordability Assessment Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent affordability management process, which includes the establishment of affordability goals, and a recurring assessment of cost performance through the use of jointly established metrics. • Excellent methodology for establishing a starting value (T-1) and Affordability Improvement Curve for URF. • Excellent methodology for developing URF and TOC estimates and reconciling differences with the Government. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High-quality affordability management process, which includes the establishment of affordability goals, and a recurring assessment of cost performance through the use of jointly established metrics. • High-quality methodology for establishing a starting value (T-1) and Affordability Improvement Curve for URF. • High-quality methodology for developing URF and TOC estimates and reconciling differences with the Government. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reasonable definition of an affordability management process, which includes the establishment of affordability goals, and a recurring assessment of cost performance through the use of jointly established metrics. • Reasonable definition of a methodology for establishing a starting value (T-1) and Affordability Improvement Curve for URF. • Reasonable definition of a methodology for developing URF and TOC estimates and reconciling differences with the Government. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delayed or incomplete definition of an affordability management process, which includes the establishment of affordability goals, and a recurring assessment of cost performance through the use of jointly established metrics. • Delayed or incomplete definition of a methodology for establishing a starting value (T-1) and Affordability Improvement Curve for Unit Recurring Flyaway (URF). • Delayed or incomplete definition of a methodology for developing URF and TOC estimates and reconciling differences with the Government. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contractor fails to meet criteria for Marginal performance.

		<u>Exceptional</u>	<u>Very Good</u>	<u>Satisfactory</u>	<u>Marginal</u>	<u>Unsatisfactory</u>
Management	Responsiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent use of the IPT philosophy to manage the program on a daily basis. • Excellent business practices for orderly air system evolution. • Excellent preparation for working groups and technical interchange meetings. • Proactive approach to minimize and resolve issues leading to suspenses and action items. • Proactive approach to implementing formal Government direction. • Excellent coordination within the prime contractor's organization and with other Government/commercial participants of the JSF Program. • Timely and accurate development and implementation of a robust manpower staffing plan. • Timely development and implementation of an excellent security clearance plan. • Timely and effective development of a seamless and automated integrated management information system that interfaces with the JSF Virtual Enterprise and includes the Integrated Master Schedule (IMS), Integrated Master Plan (IMP), Performance Measurement Baseline (PMB), Earned Value Management System (EVMS), etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highly effective use of the IPT philosophy to manage the program on a daily basis. • Highly effective business practices for orderly air system evolution. • Highly effective preparation for working groups and technical interchange meetings. • Timely and accurate responses to suspenses and action items. • Timely and complete response to formal Government direction. • Highly effective coordination within the prime contractor's organization and with other Government/commercial participants of the JSF Program. • Timely and accurate development and implementation of a manpower staffing plan. • Highly effective development of a security clearance plan. • Timely and effective development of an integrated management information system that interfaces with the JSF Virtual Enterprise and includes the IMS, IMP, PMB, EVMS, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate use of the IPT philosophy to manage the program on a daily basis. • Adequate business practices for orderly air system evolution. • Adequate preparation for working groups and technical interchange meetings. • Adequate responses to suspenses and action items. • Adequate response to formal Government direction. • Adequate coordination within the prime contractor's organization and with other Government/commercial participants of the JSF Program. • Adequate development and implementation of a manpower staffing plan. • Adequate development of a security clearance plan. • Adequate development of an integrated management information system that interfaces with JSF Virtual Enterprise and includes the IMS, IMP, PMB, EVMS, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited use of the IPT philosophy to manage the program on a daily basis. • Weak business practices for orderly air system evolution. • Limited preparation for working groups and technical interchange meetings. • Late or low quality responses to suspenses or action items. • Late or incomplete response to formal Government direction. • Poor coordination within the prime contractor's organization or with other Government/commercial participants of the JSF Program. • Limited development and implementation of a manpower staffing plan. • Limited development of a security clearance plan. • Limited development of an integrated management information system that system that interfaces with JSF Virtual Enterprise and includes the IMS, IMP, PMB, EVMS, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contractor fails to meet criteria for Marginal performance.
	Schedule Performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timely and accurate development and maintenance of a comprehensive IMP and IMS. • Exceeds established program milestones. • Timely development and implementation of an excellent schedule risk mitigation process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timely and accurate development and maintenance of program IMP and IMS. • Meets or exceeds established program milestones. • Timely development and implementation of a schedule risk mitigation process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate development of program IMP or IMS. • Meets established program milestones. • Adequately defined and implemented schedule risk mitigation process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Late or incomplete development of program IMP or IMS. • Fails to meet established program milestones. • Poorly defined or implemented schedule risk mitigation process. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contractor fails to meet criteria for Marginal performance.

		<u>Exceptional</u>	<u>Very Good</u>	<u>Satisfactory</u>	<u>Marginal</u>	<u>Unsatisfactory</u>
Management Continued	Subcontract Management (Includes Small Business Utilization)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent management of and performance by subcontractors, partners, associate contractors, and vendors. • Excellent leadership of the IPT-managed Propulsion System. • Excellent integration of subcontractors, partners, associate contractors, and key vendors into the Contractor's automated management information system. • Excellent surveillance and monitoring of the compliance and maintenance of key subcontractors' EVMS. • Timely, accurate, complete, and automated integration of subcontractor's cost data. • Significant benefits derived from innovative products developed by small businesses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highly effective management of and performance by subcontractors, partners, associate contractors, and vendors. • Highly effective leadership of the IPT-managed Propulsion System. • Highly effective integration of subcontractors, partners, associate contractors, and key vendors into the Contractor's automated management information system. • Highly effective surveillance and monitoring of the compliance and maintenance of key subcontractors' EVMS. • Timely, accurate, and complete integration of subcontractor's cost data. • Some benefits derived from innovative products developed by small businesses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate management of and performance by subcontractors, partners, associate contractors, and vendors. • Adequate leadership of the IPT-managed Propulsion System. • Integration of subcontractors, partners, associate contractors, and key vendors into the Contractor's automated management information system. • Adequate surveillance and monitoring of the compliance and maintenance of key subcontractors' EVMS. • Timely and accurate integration of subcontractor's cost data. • Limited benefits derived from innovative products developed by small businesses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor management of or performance by subcontractors, partners, associate contractors, and vendors. • Poor leadership of the IPT-managed Propulsion System. • Limited integration of subcontractors, partners, associate contractors, and key vendors into the Contractor's automated management information system. • Limited surveillance and monitoring of the compliance and maintenance of key subcontractors' EVMS. • Late or inaccurate integration of subcontractor's cost data. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contractor fails to meet criteria for Marginal performance.

		<u>Exceptional</u>	<u>Very Good</u>	<u>Satisfactory</u>	<u>Marginal</u>	<u>Unsatisfactory</u>
Technical	Air System Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent reporting and achievement of performance measures. • Strict adherence to a high quality systems engineering approach. • Development and implementation of an excellent risk management process. • Timely and complete identification and management of comprehensive internal and external system interfaces. • Development and implementation of an excellent mass properties management approach. • Excellent propulsion system integration and comprehensive interface control management. • Excellent progress toward meeting program commonality goals. • Exceeds some and meets all key performance characteristics. • Excellent air system architecture development process. • Excellent avionics integration and comprehensive interface control management. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Successful reporting and achievement of performance measures. • Adherence to a high quality systems engineering approach. • Development and implementation of a high quality risk management process. • Timely and complete identification and management of detailed internal and external system interfaces. • Development and implementation of a high quality mass properties management approach. • High quality propulsion system integration and interface control management. • Significant progress toward meeting program commonality goals. • Meets or exceeds key performance characteristics. • High quality air system architecture development process. • High quality avionics integration and interface control management. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate development and reporting of performance measures. • Adherence to a disciplined systems engineering approach. • Adequate development and implementation of a risk management process. • Timely and complete identification and management of both internal and external system interfaces. • Development and implementation of an adequate mass property management approach. • Adequate propulsion system integration and interface control management. • Adequate progress toward meeting program commonality goals. • Meets key performance characteristics. • Adequate air system architecture development process. • Adequate avionics integration and interface control management. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimal development and reporting of performance measures. • Minimal adherence to a disciplined systems engineering approach. • Minimal development and implementation of a risk management process. • Delayed or incomplete identification or management of both internal and external system interfaces. • Minimal development and implementation of a mass properties management approach. • Minimal propulsion system integration and interface control management. • Minimal progress toward meeting program commonality goals. • Fails to meet some key performance characteristics. • Weak air system architecture development process. • Minimal avionics integration and interface control management 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contractor fails to meet criteria for Marginal performance.
	Air System Software Development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development and implementation of an extremely robust system software development approach. • Development and maintenance of an extremely robust, common software engineering environment. • Excellent reporting and achievement of a comprehensive set of air system software metrics. • Timely development and successful implementation of a robust software staffing plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development and implementation of a high quality system software development approach. • Development and maintenance of a high quality common software engineering environment. • High quality reporting and significant achievement of a comprehensive set of air system software metrics. • Timely development and implementation of a high-quality software staffing plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development and implementation of an adequate system software development approach. • Development and maintenance of an adequate common software engineering environment. • Timely reporting and achievement of a common set of air system software metrics. • Timely development and implementation of a software staffing plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimal development or implementation of a system software development approach. • Minimal development or maintenance of a common software engineering environment. • Late or incomplete development or achievement of a common set of air system software metrics. • Late development or incomplete implementation of a software staffing plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contractor fails to meet criteria for Marginal performance.

		<u>Exceptional</u>	<u>Very Good</u>	<u>Satisfactory</u>	<u>Marginal</u>	<u>Unsatisfactory</u>
Developmental Cost Control	EVMS Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excellent cost control and reporting system. • Implementation and maintenance of an excellent Performance Measurement Baseline. • Excellent cost performance reports. • Evidence of an EVMS that is seamlessly integrated with other management systems especially the Integrated Master Schedule. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High-quality cost control and reporting system. • Implementation and maintenance of a high-quality Performance Measurement Baseline. • High-quality cost performance reports. • Evidence of an EVMS that is highly integrated with other management systems especially the Integrated Master Schedule. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate cost control and reporting system. • Implementation and maintenance of the Performance Measurement Baseline. • Adequate cost performance reports. • Adequate integration of the EVMS with other management systems especially the Integrated Master Schedule. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inadequate cost control and reporting system. • Delayed or incomplete implementation and maintenance of the Performance Measurement Baseline. • Delayed or low quality cost performance reports. • Poor integration of the EVMS with other management systems especially the Integrated Master Schedule. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contractor fails to meet criteria for Marginal performance.
	Actual Performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule Performance Index greater than or equal to 1.0. • Cost Performance Index greater than or equal to 1.0. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule Performance Index greater than or equal to .95 and less than 1.0. • Cost Performance Index greater than or equal to .95 and less than 1.0. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule Performance Index greater than or equal to .90 and less than .95 • Cost Performance Index greater than or equal to .90 and less than .95 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule Performance Index greater than or equal to .80 less than .90. • Cost Performance Index greater than or equal to .80 less than .90. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contractor fails to meet criteria for Marginal performance.